

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1-13 are rejected. New claims 19 and 20 are added. Claims 1-3 are amended. Claims 1-20 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

I. IN THE DRAWINGS

It is asserted in the Office Action that Figures 2-9 should be corrected to read --PRIOR ART-- instead of "PAIOR ART". Applicant has amended the Figures as suggested and submits replacement sheets for Figures 2-9. Approval is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), as being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

According to MPEP §2131, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.' (Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). 'The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.' (Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an ipsissimis verbis test, *i.e.*, identity of terminology is not required. (In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990))."

Applicant's amended claim 1 contains the limitations of "[a] semiconductor device for comparing an input address with a stored repair address, comprising: a signal controller for generating control signals including an enable signal; an address latch unit in response to the control signals for latching the input address; N number

of M-bit address comparators, each enabled by the enable signal for comparing the input address with the stored repair address; a comparator delay modeling block for delaying the enable signal for a predetermined time; and a repair circuit controller in response to a delayed control signal output from the comparator delay modeling block for generating one of a repair address enable signal and a normal address enable signal based on a comparison result of an address comparator.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 1 of AAPA does not illustrate any device that corresponds to repair address comparator 700 of the claimed invention. Distinguishable, Applicant’s Figure 12 illustrates repair address comparator 700 for receiving an enabling signal RAE_FUSE to output a delayed enabling signal AED_FUSE. AAPA does not teach, disclose or suggest “a repair circuit controller in response to a delayed control signal output from the comparator delay modeling block for generating one of a repair address enable signal and a normal address enable signal based on a comparison result of an address comparator.”

Therefore, since AAPA does not disclose, teach or suggest all of Applicant’s amended claim 1 limitations, Applicant respectfully asserts that a *prima facie* rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) has not been adequately set forth relative to AAPA. Thus, Applicant’s amended claim 1 is not anticipated by AAPA. Additionally, the claims that directly or indirectly depend on claim 1, namely claims 2-3, are also not anticipated by AAPA for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejections for claims 1-3 are respectfully requested.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner’s assertion that claims 4-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-20, as they now stand, are allowable for the reasons given above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-20 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Per 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) and in connection with the Office Action mailed on JANUARY 13, 2005, Applicant respectfully petitions the Commissioner for a one (1) month extension of time, extending the period for response to May 13, 2005. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 in the amount of \$120.00 to cover the petition filing fee for a 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(1) large entity. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 11, 2005

By: 

Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on May 11, 2005.


Jean Svoboda